

**REMARKS**

The Title of the application has been amended; support therefore can be found at page 106, line 33 to page 107, line 4 of the application. Claims 8-33 and 35-46 stand cancelled. (Of those claims cancelled, all but claim 35 were directed to non-elected subject matter.) Claims 1-2, 7 and 34 have been amended and new claims 47-52 have been added.

No new matter has been added by virtue of the within amendments; support therefor can be found throughout the specification and original claims of the application. For instance, support for amended claim 1 can be found in Item [47] appearing on page 13 of the specification; and support for amended claim 34 can be found in original claim 35. Additionally, support for new claim 47 can be found in Item [48] on page 13 of the specification; support for new claim 48 can be found in Item [49] on page 13 of the specification; support for new claim 49 can be found in Item [50] on page 13 of the specification; support for new claim 50 can be found in Item [51] on pages 13-14 of the specification; support for new claim 51 can be found in Item [52] on page 14 of the specification; and support for new claim 52 can be found in Item [53] on page 14 of the specification.

Additionally, each of the within amendments is made without prejudice to pursuing the original subject matter of this application in a later filed application claiming benefit of the instant application, including without prejudice to any determination of equivalents of the claimed subject matter.

As an initial matter, Applicants appreciate the indication that the present invention is clear of the prior art of record. In particular, the Office Action states that the "prior art of record did not disclose or suggest humanin as an agonist for those receptors known therein as FPRL1 and FPRL2 or that the agonist activation of either of these receptors inhibited forskolin stimulate adenylate cyclase activity in a mammalian cell expressing that receptor."

Referring now to outstanding issues, the title of the invention was objected to on the grounds that it is allegedly not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title herein and entry of the newly proposed title is requested. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore believed to be proper.

Claims 1-7, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, on grounds of enablement.

The Office Action asserts that the specification lacks enablement for the full scope of the claims. Particular objection is taken to the terms "substantially the same" and "partial peptide thereof" as recited in the original claims.

While it is believed that the full scope of the original claims meets the requirements of 35 USC §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the rejected claims have been amended to further define the features of the present invention. Terms such as "substantially the same" and "partial peptide thereof" have been removed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, rejection are requested.

Claims 1-7, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. It is believed that this rejection also is overcome by the within amendments. As noted above, the term "substantially the same" has been removed from the newly amended claim set. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 1-6 and 34 stand further rejected under 35 USC §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. Indefiniteness is alleged for failing to recite active, positive steps which are involved in the claimed method/process. By virtue of the within amendments, the claimed methods now include positive steps for screening target compounds. Thus, the rejection is believed to be obviated.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, is therefore requested.

Claims 1-6 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC §101. It is alleged that the claimed use (without setting forth any steps involved in the process) fails to provide a properly defined process. As indicated above, by virtue of the within amendments, the claimed methods now recite positive steps for screening target compounds. Thus, the rejection is believed to be obviated.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §101, is therefore requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for immediate allowance.

Dated: August 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Christine C. O'Day  
Christine C. O'Day  
Registration No.: 38,256  
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE  
LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, Massachusetts 02205  
(617) 439-4444  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant